Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)		
10/599,653	OOMURA, HIROSHI		
Examiner	Art Unit		

	Nicholas C. Pachol	2625		
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the o	correspondence add	ress	
THE REPLY FILED <u>24 March 2010</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.				
1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following rapplication in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appe for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 C periods:	replies: (1) an amendment, affidavi al (with appeal fee) in compliance	t, or other evidence, w with 37 CFR 41.31; or	hich places the (3) a Request	
a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Adno event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire la Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (I MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f	dvisory Action, or (2) the date set forth tter than SIX MONTHS from the mailing b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE	g date of the final rejectio	n.	
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date of have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extruder 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL	ension and the corresponding amount hortened statutory period for reply origi	of the fee. The appropria nally set in the final Offic	te extension fee e action; or (2) as	
 The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in compl filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed wi AMENDMENTS 	ision thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the		
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, be (a) They raise new issues that would require further core (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below (c) They are not deemed to place the application in bett appeal; and/or (d) They present additional claims without canceling a content of the second c	nsideration and/or search (see NO w); er form for appeal by materially red	ΓE below); ducing or simplifying th		
NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)). 4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12 5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): 6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be allowed.				
non-allowable claim(s). 7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is prove The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE	☐ will not be entered, or b) ☐ wil		_	
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). 				
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to or showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary	vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appea and was not earlier presented. Se	al and/or appellant fails ee 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1)	s to provide a	
 The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER The request for reconsideration has been considered but 		•		
 11. The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: See Continuation Sheet. 12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s) 13. Other: 				
/Twyler L. Haskins/ Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2625	/Nicholas C Pachol/ Examiner, Art Unit 2625			

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicant's arguments filed 03/24/10 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. In regards to applicant's argument that Elwell does not teach "a plurality of device IDS corresponding to a plurality of functions," the examiner respectfully disagrees. The examiner notes that Elwell was used to show that a multifunction apparatus can be treated as multiple separate apparatus based on the each function. Elwell shows that each function will have a separate device driver associated with it. In order to reference each of the functions separately the individual device driver to that function will need to be referenced. Nishio shows that each apparatus that has a device driver is associated with a device ID, in paragraph 62. This shows that in order to communicate with the device properly in Nishio, there is the need to establish a device ID. Therefore, since each device of Elwell has a separate device driver and can be referenced independently of the whole multifunction apparatus, then when used with Nishio and device ID would be established. Therefore Nishio in view of Elwell does teach "a plurality of device IDS corresponding to a plurality of functions."